~~OP.3100.2.215~~
OP.2100.2.062(10)

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD

FOOD STANDARDS COMMITTEE
REPORT ON THE
ICE CREAM STANDARD

©

LONDON
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
1957
EIGHTPENCE NET

FOOD STANDARDS COMMITTEE

The Food Standards Committee was appointed by the Minister of Food in 1947 with the following terms of reference:

To advise the Ministers of Food and Health and the Secretary of State for Scotland as to the provision to be made concerning the composition of foods (other than liquid milk) and the labelling or marking of any foods for which such provision is made, by:—

(*a*) Statutory Orders under the Defence (Sale of Food) Regulations; or

(*b*) Regulations (other than Milk and Dairies Regulations) under the Food and Drugs Acts, and corresponding enactments relating to Scotland;

for preventing danger to health, loss of nutritional value or otherwise protecting purchasers.

The Members of the Food Standards Committee are:

Norman C. Wright, Esq., C.B., M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.I.C. (*Chairman*)
G. G. Barnes, Esq., C.B.E. (*Vice-Chairman*)
C. A. Adams, Esq., C.B.E., B.Sc., F.R.I.C., Barrister-at-Law
N. R. Beattie, Esq., M.D., D.P.H.
Colin S. Dence, Esq., B.A.
A. Glover, Esq., O.B.E., M.Sc., F.R.I.C.
A. J. Howard, Esq., M.A., F.R.I.C.
J. M. Johnston, Esq., C.B.E., M.D., M.R.C.P.E., F.R.C.S.(Ed.), F.R.S.E.
G. W. Monier-Williams, Esq., O.B.E., M.C., M.A., Ph.D., F.R.I.C.
Professor B. S. Platt, C.M.G., M.Sc., M.B., Ch.B., Ph.D.
A. Propper, Esq., M.B.E.
H. G. Smith, Esq., B.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.I.C.
R. W. Sutton, Esq., O.B.E., B.Sc., F.R.I.C., F.C.S.
G. Taylor, Esq., O.B.E., F.R.I.C.
R. F. Tyas, Esq.

Joint Secretaries:

M. D. M. Franklin, Esq.
W. M. Shortt, Esq., M.Sc., F.R.I.C.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD

FOOD STANDARDS COMMITTEE

REPORT ON THE ICE CREAM STANDARD

Introduction

1. The Food Standards (Ice Cream) Order, 1953 specifies that ice cream shall contain not less than 5 per cent fat, 10 per cent sugar and 7½ per cent milk-solids-not-fat (M.S.N.F.). Ice cream containing fruit may either conform to this standard or have a lower M.S.N.F. content of 2 per cent, provided there is a minimum content of 25 per cent for fat, sugar and M.S.N.F. combined. Parev (kosher) ices must contain not less than 10 per cent fat and 14 per cent sugar. For the purpose of the standard, "sugar" means sucrose, invert sugar or the solids of any sweeting material derived from starch, but at least 7½ per cent of sucrose must be present.

2. When the standard was first introduced in 1951, the announcement by the then Ministry of Food made it clear that the minimum requirements were to be regarded as interim ones and could be improved as supplies of ingredients became more plentiful. Supplies are now freely available and we have therefore reviewed the standard to see whether it requires revision in the light of present day conditions and current commercial practice.

3. We invited certain of our members to give the matter preliminary consideration and circulated their tentative proposals to interested parties as a way of obtaining their views. The proposals put forward were as follows:—

(*a*) that the nature of the fat content should be unspecified (as at present) but the descriptions "dairy ice cream" and "cream ice" reserved for products in which the fat content is wholly milk fat. No claims for the presence of added milk fat in ordinary ice cream should be allowed.

(*b*) that the minimum fat content should be raised from 5 to 8 per cent.

(*c*) that the minimum content of M.S.N.F. should be raised from 7½ to 9 per cent.

(*d*) that the present requirements for sugar and sucrose should be replaced by a prohibition of the use of saccharin.

(*e*) that a standard should be provided for "milk ice" containing not less than 3 per cent of milk fat and not less than 9 per cent M.S.N.F.

(*f*) that a minimum weight of total solids per gallon should be prescribed.

4. The comments of the various organisations concerned on these proposals are dealt with *seriatim* in our report. A list of those who gave evidence appears in the Appendix.

Use of the description "ice cream"

5. The present Standards Order does not specify the kind of fat to be used in the manufacture of ice cream. Originally, ice cream was undoubtedly a dairy product. Before the war, the sale of non-milk fat ice cream was illegal in Northern Ireland. In other parts of the United Kingdom, most manufacturers were using milk fat, although some products made with margarine were on sale. During the war (when the use of cream or milk in ice cream was prohibited) all manufacturers used other fats. Because of the supply situation in 1951, the non-milk fat product was accepted in the Order as ice cream. The bulk of ice

cream now produced in this country is made from margarine and other non-milk fats and there is little sign of any return to the widespread use of milk fat.

6. It is generally agreed that the use of non-milk fats for the manufacture of ice cream should be allowed to continue, but there is a widespread feeling—which we share—that by some means a distinction should be made between those products made from milk fat and those made from other fats. Most people attribute some special value to dairy products and we think they are entitled to know when milk fat has been used. The consumer cannot distinguish between one and the other at the time of purchase and may not be able to tell by taste.

7. One way of emphasising the difference would be to restrict the use of the description "ice cream" to the product made exclusively (or substantially) with milk fat. This solution has been strongly urged upon us by the organisations concerned with the production and marketing of milk. They argue that the word "cream" in the description leads the purchaser to assume that it is made from dairy products and that to allow products made from non-milk fat to be sold as "ice cream" is inconsistent with those sections of the Food and Drugs Act, 1955, which restrict the use of the word "cream". They point out that there is now an abundance of milk fat in the United Kingdom and that all ice cream manufacturers could be fully supplied with milk fat from home production. The ice cream manufacturers, on the other hand, and some organisations connected with the dairy industry are in favour of the retention of the name "ice cream" for the product made without milk fat on the grounds of long usage, and consider that this is not now likely to mislead the public.

8. To confine the term "ice cream" to the product made from milk fat would seem to be more consistent with the general spirit of food and drugs legislation, though we are advised that its use to describe the non-milk fat product is not an infringement of Section 47 of the Food and Drugs Act (or Section 18 of the Food and Drugs (Scotland) Act, 1956) since the product does not purport to be a substitute for cream. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether the public any longer believe that they are buying a dairy product when they buy ice cream. To insist that the product with which the public is familiar as "ice cream" should now be re-named, say, "frozen dessert" would, in our view, be unreasonable. Nor would it be appropriate to require it to be sold as "ice", since this description properly applies only to frozen water and is, in any case, not sufficiently distinctive. The local authority associations (with one exception) and other bodies concerned with enforcement accept, though with some reluctance, the conclusion that the term "ice cream" must continue to be permitted for the non-milk fat product.

9. In view of this conclusion, we propose an alternative means of distinguishing the two products, namely that of restricting the use of certain special descriptions to the milk fat product. *We recommend that special provision should be made to reserve the description "dairy ice cream" (and other descriptions likely to suggest the use of dairy ingredients) for ice cream in which the fat content is wholly milk fat.** In all other respects, "dairy ice cream" should conform to the standard. Use of the description by the manufacturers using only milk fat would be permissive and not obligatory; but manufacturers using non-milk fat should not be allowed to use any description likely to lead the purchaser to think that he is buying a dairy product. The description "cream ice" is one which, in our view, is likely to have this effect and its use, like that of similar descriptions, ought not to be allowed for the non-milk fat product.

---

*Allowance will have to be made for traces of non-milk fat necessarily introduced by the use of flavouring materials such as cocoa.

10. The use of mixtures of milk fat and non-milk fat would be permissible, but for the sake of simple and informative labelling we consider that such products should be described as "ice cream" and that no special claims for the addition of dairy ingredients containing milk fat should in such cases be allowed.

11. One difficulty which has been pointed out to us is that the word "dairy" features in the trading names of many ice cream manufacturers, and if they manufacture and sell a non-milk fat ice cream under that name it could be regarded as misleading. This also applies to trade names which might suggest that the article was a dairy product. We think, however, that in such cases labels and notices could be printed so as to avoid confusion, and that the general provisions of the Food and Drugs Act and the Labelling of Food Order should be sufficient protection against misrepresentation.

Control of Overrun

12. The problems created by overrun in ice cream are of crucial importance for the rest of our recommendations and it will be convenient if we deal with them at this point. During the freezing process, air is whipped in so that the volume of the solidified ice cream is considerably greater than the volume of the original liquid mix. The increase in volume due to the additional air expressed as a percentage of the original volume is known as overrun. In practice, two types of of ice cream are commonly on sale in this country with widely different degrees of overrun. A small manufacturer may only impart 20–30 per cent overrun, while the large manufacturer using different equipment and technique is able to achieve a 100 per cent overrun or even more.

13. The present standards of fat, M.S.N.F. and sugar relate to content by weight in the liquid mix; ice cream is, however, not bought by weight, and the amount of food solids in a given volume of the article purchased depends not only on the mix but on the amount of overrun imparted by the manufacturer. To achieve a high overrun the manufacturer normally has to include a higher proportion of total solids in the mix, though they may not be increased in proportion. This means that an increase in the minimum standard based on the mix is likely to affect the manufacturer who makes ice cream with a low overrun much more than the manufacturer of a high overrun product. It also suggests, that from the standpoint of the consumer, an ice cream standard which does not in some way take account of overrun is incomplete.

14. There are a number of ways in which overrun could be taken into account. There would be no problem if ice cream were required to be sold by weight, but this would be inconvenient and contrary to accepted trade practice. An upper limit could be set to the degree of overrun, but this would only impose a ceiling without dealing with the real problem created by variations in overrun between different types of ice cream. Perhaps the most logical way would be to base the entire standard on a unit volume of finished ice cream instead of on the weight of the mix and this solution was, in fact, proposed to us by the Ice Cream Alliance, which is the body most representative of the smaller manufacturers. They proposed that the standard should require ice cream to contain not less than 31 oz. of total food solids per gallon (the standard measure of volume), of which 7·5 oz. should be fat and 8·5 oz. M.S.N.F.

15. A less radical change would be to introduce a standard for the minimum weight of solids per gallon while retaining requirements of the present kind as to the percentage composition of the liquid mix. Such a provision is included in the ice cream standards of several other countries and was included in the proposals we circulated to interested parties. The idea of controlling overrun in this

way was opposed in principle only by the Wholesale Ice Cream Federation, who maintained that it would be unworkable and would not in any case benefit the consumer. The view of the majority of local authority associations and the other bodies concerned with enforcement was that some control of overrun was essential, or at least desirable. Doubts were, however, expressed about the practicability of enforcing such control, and it is on this aspect that we have found it necessary to concentrate.

16. Any provision relating to overrun would have to be such that all types of producers could comply with it without undue difficulty. Such a provision might be thought to present most difficulty for the smaller manufacturer, but we have received evidence from the trade that such manufacturers, who use a vertical freezer, could with practice keep within plus or minus 5 per cent of the desired overrun. Representatives of the large factory producers, on the other hand, told us that while they endeavoured to work to this tolerance, wider variations would occur and that with an average overrun of 100 per cent the actual results might vary between 70 and 130 per cent. While we recognise that there would be difficulties for manufacturers, we are not convinced that, with a reasonable tolerance, it would be impracticable for them to conform to a provision related to overrun.

17. From the point of view of legal enforcement, the difficulties appear to us to be more formidable. Any of the possible ways of taking account of overrun depend upon accurate measurement of the volume of a known weight of ice cream. Broadly speaking, there are two possible methods of proceeding:—

(*a*) measurement of volume at the time of sampling;

(*b*) the retention of the sample in the same physical state as it was when taken until the volume can be measured by the analyst.

18. Either method is open to the objection that physical changes beyond the control of the manufacturer may occur between the time of manufacture and point of sale. In the case of method (*a*), a further difficulty arises because when bulk ice cream is sampled it may be compressed to some degree in taking the sample. It is true that any alteration in volume will be in favour of the manufacturer but the point might neverthless give rise to argument in any legal proceedings. We understand that a British Standards Institution Committee on the Sampling of Ice Cream has examined possible instruments but so far no device appears to be available which would obtain a constant volume of ice cream without variable distortion of its original state. Even if a suitable instrument could be perfected, regulations would be required to vary the normal sampling procedure so as to permit the sampling officer to take three separate samples and certify that each was of the same known volume at the time of sampling. The Ice Cream Alliance have indicated that they would have no objection to such a procedure, but the Association of Public Analysts have represented that the analyst should not be put in a position of having to sign a certificate based on figures for which he was not responsible. They therefore would favour method (*b*) and did not foresee any insuperable difficulty in transporting the sample if it were packed in solid carbon dioxide or in measuring the volume satisfactorily by a displacement method. The Institute of Weights and Measures Administration concurred in this view though they suggested that the sampling officer might himself measure the volume of the ice cream in this way.

19. Serious difficulties arise, however, in connection with the retention by the vendor of his part of the sample and, more particularly, with the storage of the reference part of the sample. Ice cream which is stored even at a low temper-

ature for any length of time is usually subject to shrinkage and loss of weight. So far as the vendor's part of the sample is concerned, it has been suggested that the difficulty might be minimised if the sampling officer took the additional part and kept it in a suitable deep freeze for the vendor to collect at the appropriate time. We do not, however, know to what extent deep freezes are available for this purpose. Many food and drugs authorities have refrigerators for keeping food and drugs samples, but they could not be expected to be satisfactory for retaining samples of ice cream in their original condition. The third part of the sample would, under the existing provisions of the law, have to be kept by the sampling officer for perhaps as much as six months before it might have to be submitted to the Government Chemist, and we do not yet know under what conditions, if at all, ice cream can be kept in its original state for such a long period.

20. In other countries where standards include a provision relating to overrun, as for example in the United States and Canada, these particular difficulties do not arise since the legal requirements there do not involve the retention of a reference part of the sample. Our enquiries with regard to experience in other countries do not suggest that we have over-emphasised the difficulties of effective and equitable enforcement of an overrun provision in this country.

21. In all the circumstances, we are not satisfied that provisions in a standard which require the measurement of overrun can as yet be properly enforced. We are, however, continuing to examine the problem and hope with the assistance of the interests concerned to be able to arrange for such further experimental work as may be necessary. Work of this kind is likely to take some two or three years; we shall thus probably not be able to make a final recommendation on this matter for some considerable time. It remains to consider whether in the interim any alterations should be made in the existing standards.

Minimum fat content

22. The tentative proposal put forward for discussion was to raise the minimum standard for fat from 5 to 8 per cent. This was supported by all except one local authority association, by other bodies concerned with enforcement and by the dairying interests. It was opposed by the ice cream trade. As has been said, the Ice Cream Alliance put forward proposals for altering the whole basis of the standard, but they indicated that, if these were not acceptable, they would oppose any increase in the present standards both for fat and milk-solids-not-fat.

23. The fact that the present limit was fixed in a time of scarcity would suggest that the level could appropriately be raised now that supplies are plentiful. The bulk of ice cream now on sale in this country does contain substantially more than 5 per cent of fat in the mix and it might be argued that the standard should be raised to bring it more into line with the practice of the manufacturers concerned. Indeed, some organisations have represented to us that the minimum standard should be raised to 10 per cent. It might also be pointed out that standards for ice cream in other countries generally provide for a fat content of at least 8 per cent, and in some cases 10 or 12 per cent.

24. On the other hand, the trade suggest that the present standard provides the public with an adequate minimum safeguard with ample scope for manufacturers to use a richer mix if they wish to do so for technical or other reasons; that an increase in the present limit would operate against the smaller manufacturer whose normal practice is to use a mix containing only just over 5 per cent of fat but to give it a relatively small overrun; and finally that it would place

the small manufacturers in greater jeopardy because of the difficulty of spreading the fat evenly throughout the mix.

25. In our view, there is considerable force in the second of these arguments. The nationally distributed brands of ice cream, which form a substantial proportion of total sales, already contain 10 per cent or more of fat in the mix; they would therefore readily conform to an 8 per cent standard, and the effect of raising the standard would merely be to safeguard the consumer of this type of ice cream from a possible reduction in the amount of fat used in the future. On the other hand, an increase from 5 to 8 per cent would require many smaller manufacturers to add more fat to the mix than they do at present. This might be justified if the disparity in present practices was reflected in the final product, but because the richer mix is normally given a much higher overrun, the effect of the disparity is reduced or eliminated in the final product. To increase the minimum requirement for the mix without taking any account of overrun would really have the effect of compelling one type of manufacturer to conform to a higher standard than his competitors. To offset this he might well be obliged to increase the overrun and thus there would be no ultimate benefit to the consumer. We do not, therefore, think that an increase in the standard unrelated to overrun would be justified. The current standard of 5 per cent in practice provides the public with a reasonable measure of protection and, *until such time as the problem of overrun can be satisfactorily dealt with, we recommend that no change should be made in the present provision.*

26. We have considered whether it would be appropriate to require the use of vitaminised margarine where margarine is used to provide the whole or part of the fat content. We understand the general practice of the trade is to use manufacturing margarine, which is not required to conform to the standards of vitamin content laid down under the Food Standards (Margarine) Order, 1954. We do not think there is a sufficiently strong case for requiring the use of vitaminised margarine in ice cream; but manufacturers should not be prevented from using it if they so wish.

Standard of milk-solids-not-fat content

27. Ice cream manufacturers are opposed to any increase in the minimum percentage of milk-solids-not-fat for the same reasons as they oppose an increase in the standard of fat content. Those organisations concerned with enforcement, on the other hand, welcomed the tentative proposal that the standard for milk-solids-not-fat should be raised from 7½ per cent to 9 per cent either on nurtitional grounds or because the higher figure appeared to be more in line with commercial practice.

28 The arguments we have set out in paragraph 24 above apply also to the standard for milk-solids-not-fat. In the absence of provisions which take account of overrun, we do not think there is sufficient justification for raising the minimum requirement and *we consider that the existing standard of 7½ per cent should be retained for the time being.*

Control of sugar content

29. The present standard provides for a minimum of 10 per cent sugar; 7½ per cent of sucrose must be present, but otherwise glucose, invert sugar or hydrolysed starch may be used. The argument for specifying a minimum *sucrose* content is that only thus can the consumer be guaranteed a minimum degree of sweetness; the other sugars provide the same calorific value, weight for weight,

as sucrose. We think it doubtful, however, whether there is need to restrict the manufacturers' choice of sugars in order to ensure a minimum sweetness. The consumer is well able to judge sweetness for himself and, moreover, we have been told that the degree of sweetness desired varies in different localities.

30. A minimum limit for *sugar* content can be defended on nutritional grounds; but another way of achieving the same object would be to prohibit the use of saccharin in ice cream.* This would leave manufacturers free to use whatever forms of sugar they thought best while at the same time ensuring that the demands of the public as regards sweetness are satisfied by the use of nutritive substances and not by the use of artificial sweeteners of no nutritional value.

31. None of the organisations consulted specifically objected to the tentative proposal to replace the existing standard for sugar by a prohibition on the use of saccharin, but the ice cream manufacturers said they could see no justification for singling out ice cream for such a ban. In our view, the fact that saccharin is not at present used to any appreciable extent in the manufacture of ice cream and the fact that ice cream is consumed to a very large extent by children, provide sound reasons for introducing such a provision, bearing in mind also the obligation of Ministers under Section 4(2) of the Food and Drugs Act, 1955 and Section 4(2) of the Food and Drugs (Scotland) Act, 1956. *We therefore recommend that the limits on sugar and sucrose in the present Order should be replaced by a prohibition on the use of saccharin or other artificial sweeteners.* If diabetic ice cream is made, then provided it is suitably described, an appropriate exemption should be made for this product.

Provision for ice cream made from liquid milk

32. We received representations from the Ice Cream Alliance that provision should be made in the standards for a soft ice cream made from liquid milk, sugar, cornflour and sometimes eggs. This type of ice cream is alleged to have been widely sold in Scotland and to be preferred by many customers to the hard ice cream which is generally on sale in this country. The trade say, however, that the demand for an ice cream made from liquid milk is by no means restricted to Scotland and exists also in many areas of England and Wales and Northern Ireland.

33. The fat content of this type of product, which is provided by the milk, is considerably less than 5 per cent. It cannot, therefore, legally be sold as ice cream under the present standard. The legality of its sale under the description "milk ice" has been challenged in the Scottish courts. The trade argue that it would be unreasonable to require the addition of fat and M.S.N.F. to the product to bring it up to the standard prescribed in the Order. We are told that it would be uneconomic to add cream, and that the addition of margarine or other fats would not only make the product unpalatable but would alter its traditional nature.

34. The proposal to introduce a separate standard for this type of product is supported by other trade interests including several of the organisations connected with the dairy industry; but it was opposed by others. There was a similar division of opinion among the local authority associations, but in both cases the weight of opinion appears to be in favour of the proposal. It is argued against the provision of a separate standard that there is no reason why ice cream made from liquid milk should not be required to come up to the same

---

*Other artificial sweeteners are already prohibited by the Artificial Sweeteners in Food Order, 1953.

standard of nutrition as other ice cream, if necessary by the addition of other fat. As the fat and M.S.N.F. content of milk varies seasonally, it is not in any case possible to produce a mix of uniform composition from liquid milk throughout the year. Provision of a separate standard would, it is argued, introduce an element of quality grading unrelated to selling price.

35. It is very difficult to estimate the extent of the demand for this product. As it cannot legally be sold as ice cream, evidence of sales is of little value. The statement of the trade that this is a popular article is supported by one of the Scottish local authority associations. On the other hand, we have been told by local authorities in the West of Scotland and in the North of England that they are unaware of any demand in their areas. On balance, we are of the opinion that provision should be made for it in the standard since the ingredients are nutritious and the product may well be favoured by some people, particularly those who prefer ice cream which is less rich in fat. We consider, however, that it should be differentiated by description and standard of composition from ice cream which conforms to the standards of fat and milk-solids-not-fat which we have proposed.

36. The determination of a suitable description for the product presents some difficulty. In the tentative proposals which were circulated, the name "milk ice" was suggested. This description appeared to be acceptable to all the organisations which supported the idea of making special provision for the product, but it was criticised by certain dairy interests and by one food and drugs authority who were also opposed to a separate standard. Some of the objections raised seemed to be contradictory. It is argued on the one hand that it is unfair to give a new and inferior name to a genuine dairy product and use of the term "milk ice" would undermine efforts to enhance the appreciation of milk by the public, and on the other that the advertising value of the word "milk" would imply a superior product to ice cream. If there is force in the latter argument, it could perhaps be safely left to the ice cream manufacturers to ensure that the public were aware of the differences in composition of the two products if their sales were being adversely affected. Since the basis of this product, and the feature which mainly distinguishes it from ordinary ice cream, is the use of liquid milk, the description "milk ice" appears to us to have much to commend it. No suitable alternative description has been suggested.

37. A number of the organisations consulted have criticised the standards tentatively proposed of 3 per cent milk fat and 9 per cent M.S.N.F. on the grounds that they could not be attained from the use of liquid milk of normal composition without the addition of extra fat and skimmed milk powder. A typical recipe for this product would, we are told, be one gallon of milk (weighing 10.3 lbs.) to 1¼ lb. of sugar and 6 oz. of cornflour. Thus milk with a fat content of 3 per cent and a milk-solids-not-fat content of 8.5 per cent (the presumptive standards for milk) would give a fat content of 2.5 per cent and a milk-solids-not-fat content of 7.2 per cent in the mix. Since milk ice carries only a small overrun approximately these amounts will be present in the product when sold by volume.

38. We consider there is some force in the point that to require the use of other dairy ingredients as a normal practice would remove much of the justification for making special provision for a product based on liquid milk. *We therefore recommend that provision should be made for "milk ice", and that it should be required to contain not less than 2½ per cent milk fat and not less than 7 per cent milk-solids-not-fat.* The addition of non-milk fat should not be permitted.

There should be no limit for sugar content, but as with ice cream a prohibition on the use of saccharin.

Other Provisions in the Standard

39. The existing provision for ice cream containing any fruit, fruit pulp or fruit puree should be brought into line with our recommendations for ordinary ice cream by revoking the sugar requirement and extending the prohibition on saccharin to these products.

40. We also consider that the prohibition on saccharin should cover "Parev" (kosher) ice, though in this case it seems desirable to retain the special standard for sugar as well. It has been represented to us by the Jewish authorities that the provision for "Parev" (kosher) ice should include a prohibition on the use of milk and milk derivatives to ensure that products sold under this description will in fact be acceptable to the Jewish community. We consider it would be appropriate to include such a provision in order to ensure that the exemption from the standard for this product is only used for the purpose for which it was intended.

Summary of Recommendations

41. Pending the outcome of our further investigation of the problem of overrun in ice cream (paragraphs 12—21), we recommend that the Food Standards (Ice Cream) Order, 1953, should be amended:—

- (*a*) to provide that the description "dairy ice cream" (and variants likely to suggest the use of dairy ingredients) may only be applied to ice cream in which the whole of the fat content (other than any necessarily introduced by the use of a flavouring material) is milk fat (paragraphs 5—11);
- (*b*) to provide a standard for "milk ice" (paragraphs 32—38), viz. that it shall contain—
  - (i) not less than 2½ per cent milk fat,
  - (ii) not less than 7 per cent milk-solids-not-fat,
  - (iii) no fat other than milk fat;
- (*c*) to revoke the present provisions relating to the sugar content of ice cream but to include a prohibition on the use of saccharin or other artificial sweetening agents in ice cream (including that containing fruit), milk ice and Parev (kosher) ice (paragraphs 29—31);
- (*d*) to prohibit the use of milk or milk products in "Parev" (kosher) ice (paragraph 40).

FSC/REP. 39 September, 1957

APPENDIX

List of Organisations which have given evidence in connection with the Committee's review of the ice cream standard

Association of County Councils in Scotland
Association of Municipal Corporations
*Association of Public Analysts
Association of Public Health Inspectors

British Dairy Farmers' Association
British Hotels and Restaurants Association

Caterers' Association of Great Britain
Convention of Royal Burghs
Counties of Cities Association
County Councils Association
County Council of Durham

*Ice Cream Alliance
Ice Cream Powder Manufacturers' Section of the Food Manufacturers' Federation
*Institute of Weights and Measures Administration

Joint Committee of Breed Society Representatives

Metropolitan Boroughs' Standing Joint Committee
Milk Bars Association of Great Britain and Ireland Limited
Milk Marketing Board
Milk Marketing Board for Northern Ireland.

National Association of Creamery Proprietors and Wholesale Dairymen
National Caterers' Federation
National Cattle Breeders' Association
National Dairymen's Association
National Farmers' Union
North of Scotland Milk Marketing Board

Parliamentary Committee of the Co-operative Union

Quality Milk Producers Limited

Rural District Councils Association

Scottish Milk Marketing Board
Scottish Milk Trade Federation

United Synagogue
Urban District Councils Association

*Wholesale Ice Cream Federation

---

*These organisations also gave oral evidence.

Crown copyright reserved

Printed in Great Britain by The North Western Printers Limited, Heaton Lane, Stockport
and published by
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

326/3403/6474/K22/12.57 S.O. Code No. 24-260